arXiv:1511.08970v2 [math.NA] 12 Jan 2016

An Iteratively Reweighted Least Squares Algorithm for Sparse Regularization

Sergey Voronin[1] and Ingrid Daubechies[2]

[1]Applied Mathematics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, 80302, USA.
[2]Mathematics, Duke University, Durham, NC, 27708, USA.

January 13, 2016

Abstract

We present a new algorithm and the corresponding convergence analysis for the regularization of linear inverse problems with sparsity constraints, applied to a new generalized sparsity promoting functional. The algorithm is based on the idea of iteratively reweighted least squares, reducing the minimization at every iteration step to that of a functional including only ℓ_2-norms. This amounts to smoothing of the absolute value function that appears in the generalized sparsity promoting penalty we consider, with the smoothing becoming iteratively less pronounced. We demonstrate that the sequence of iterates of our algorithm converges to a limit that minimizes the original functional.

1 Introduction

Over the last several years, an abundant number of algorithms (e.g. [4, 2, 15, 14]) have been proposed for the minimization of the ℓ_1-penalized functional $F_\tau(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + 2\tau\|x\|_1$, where the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$, the vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and the constant $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The functional has a number of interesting applications, such as recovery of corrupted low rank matrices [12], face recognition [13], and in inverse problems from geophysics [8]. The $\|x\|_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{N} |x_k|$ penalty is the closest convex norm to the ℓ_0-penalty (the count of nonzeros in a signal), and the relationship between the two has been brought into focus by compressive sensing [3]. Since $\|x\|_1$ is not differentiable due to the absolute value function $|\cdot|$, standard gradient based techniques cannot be directly applied for the minimization of F_τ. In this paper, we consider a more general functional of which F_τ is a particular case. The new functional introduced in [9] which the algorithm in this paper can minimize is $F_{\mathbf{q},\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(x)$:

$$F_{\mathbf{q},\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k |x_k|^{q_k}$$

where the coefficients q_k and λ_k may be different for each $1 \le k \le N$, with $1 \le q_k \le 2$ for each k. The more general functional makes it possible to treat different components of x differently,

corresponding to their different roles. A simple example with a half sparse, half dense signal is illustrated in the Numerics section; in that case, imposing a sparsity inducing penalty on all coefficients is not ideal for proper recovery. Another important instance is the case when the penalization contains a multiscale representation (e.g. the wavelet decomposition) of an object to be reconstructed/approximated. In this case, one has an extra matrix W, representing the transform to wavelet coefficients, and the minimization problem for $w = Wx$ takes the form:

$$\bar{w} = \arg\min_{w} \left\{ \|AW^{-1}w - b\|_2^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k |w_k|^{q_k} \right\}$$

If W is a wavelet transform, then the different entries of the vector w serve distinctly different functions, some being responsible for coarse scales and others for fine details. In this case, the total number of possible coefficients corresponding to coarse scales is typically quite limited, with each of them crucial to the overall model (e.g. [8]). Thus, we do not necessarily want to impose a sparsity-promoting penalty on these coefficients, which means we would impose the choice $q_k > 1$ for them in the penalty function. On the other hand, the coefficients corresponding to fine scales may be fairly sparse in the object to be reconstructed, and the inversion procedure might, without appropriate regularization, be prone to populate them with noisy features; in this case, a sparsity promoting choice $q_k = 1$ would be indicated for those k.

With various algorithms for the minimization of functionals similar to $F_{\mathbf{q},\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, involving the non-smooth absolute value term, two approaches are commonly used. The first approach handles the non-smooth minimization problem directly. For instance, for our original F_τ, one would use the soft-thresholding operation [4] on $\mathbb{R}$, defined by:

$$S_\tau(x) = \begin{cases} x - \tau, & x \geq \tau; \\ 0, & -\tau \leq x \leq \tau; \\ x + \tau, & x \leq -\tau \ . \end{cases}$$

A soft thresholding is then defined for a vector of N elements component-wise as $(\mathbb{S}_\tau(x))_k = S_\tau(x_k) \quad \forall\, k = 1, \ldots, N$. Methods utilizing soft-thresholding rely on the identity $S_\tau(\beta) = \arg\min_a \left\{ (a - \beta)^2 + 2\tau|a| \right\}$ for scalars a and β, which for vectors x and b translates to:

$$\mathbb{S}_\tau(b) = \arg\min_{x} \left\{ \|x - b\|_2^2 + 2\tau\|x\|_1 \right\} \tag{1.1}$$

The simplest example is the Iterative Soft Thresholding Algorithm (ISTA) [4]:

$$x^{n+1} = \mathbb{S}_\tau(x^n + A^T b - A^T A x^n) \tag{1.2}$$

which for an initial x^0 and with $\|A\|_2 < 1$ (the spectral norm of A less than one, easily accomplished by rescaling), converges slowly but surely to the ℓ_1-minimizer. A faster variation on this scheme, known as FISTA [1], is frequently employed; the thresholding function can also be adjusted to correspond to more general penalties [10]. Along the same line of thinking, algorithms based on the dual space of the ℓ_1-norm have been proposed [14], with the dual being the ℓ_∞-norm.

The second approach to algorithms minimizing the ℓ_1-functional involves some kind of smoothing. One idea is to replace the entire functional by a smooth approximation. This can be done, for instance, by convolving the absolute value function with narrow Gaussians [11]. This approach then allows for the use of standard gradient based methods (such as Conjugate Gradients) for the minimization of the approximate smooth functional. The main problem with this approach is that we are then minimizing a slightly different functional from the original which does not necessarily have the same properties that the original penalty possesses.

In this manuscript, we describe an algorithm that replaces the $|x_k|^{q_k}$ term in $F_{\mathbf{q},\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with a smoothened version that gets closer and closer to the original as the iterates progress towards the limit. The algorithm presented in this manuscript builds upon the original iteratively reweighted least squares method proposed in [5], extending it to the unconstrained case and to a more general penalty. The idea can be illustrated simplest for the $q_k = 1$ case. Consider the approximation:

$$|x_k| = \frac{x_k^2}{|x_k|} = \frac{x_k^2}{\sqrt{x_k^2}} \approx \frac{x_k^2}{\sqrt{x_k^2 + \epsilon^2}}$$

where in the rightmost term, a small $\epsilon \neq 0$ is used, to insure the denominator is finite, regardless of the value of x_k. Thus, at the n-th iteration, a reweighted ℓ_2 approximation to the ℓ_1 norm of x is of the form:

$$\|x\|_1 \approx \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{(x_k)^2}{\sqrt{(x_k^n)^2 + \epsilon_n^2}} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_k^n (x_k)^2$$

where the right hand side is a reweighted two-norm with weights:

$$\tilde{w}_k^n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x_k^n)^2 + \epsilon_n^2}}. \tag{1.3}$$

Clearly, it follows that $\sum_k \tilde{w}_k^n (x_k^n)^2$ is a close approximation to $\|x^n\|_1$. In the same way, we can use the slightly more general weights:

$$w_k^n = \frac{1}{[(x_k^n)^2 + \epsilon_n^2]^{\frac{2-q_k}{2}}}. \tag{1.4}$$

for the approximation $|x_k^n|^{q_k} \approx w_k^n (x_k^n)^2$ to hold; these can then deal with the case $1 \leq q_k \leq 2$.

We shall use a sequence $\{\epsilon_n\}$ such that $\epsilon_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The choice of the sequence $\{\epsilon_n\}$ is important for convergence analysis. Although in practice, different approaches can work, the rate at which it converges needs to match that of the iterates x^n. In our analysis, we will use the following definition:

$$\epsilon_n = \min\left(\epsilon_{n-1}, \left(\|x^n - x^{n-1}\|_2 + \alpha^n\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad 0 < \alpha < 1 \tag{1.5}$$

The resulting algorithm we present and analyze is very similar in form to (1.2):

$$x_k^{n+1} = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_k q_k w_k^n}\left(x_k^n + (A^T b)_k - (A^T A x^n)_k\right) \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N. \tag{1.6}$$

with the thresholding replaced by an iteration dependent scaling operation using the weights (1.4). The algorithm is found to be numerically competitive with the thresholding based schemes for the ℓ_1-case but has the advantage that it can handle the minimization of more general functionals of the form $F_{\mathbf{q},\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. The main contribution of this paper is a detailed proof of convergence, the methodology of which can be readily applied to analyze similar schemes. An added advantage of a scheme in which all terms are quadratic in the unknown x is that it can be combined with a conjugate gradient approach to speed up the algorithm. In [9] such an algorithm was proposed, and convergence proved if at each reweighted step, the conjugate gradient scheme was pursued to convergence. In [6], the more general and more realistic situation is considered, where only some conjugate gradient steps are taken at each iteration. In both cases, the choice of $\{\epsilon_n\}$ (e.g. (1.5)), remains crucial for the convergence analysis.

2 Constructions

2.1 Analysis of the generalized sparsity inducing functional

Here, we derive and comment on the optimality conditions of the functional:

$$F(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k |x_k|^{q_k}, \tag{2.1}$$

for the range $1 \leq q_k \leq 2$, where in (2.1), we drop the subscripts $\mathbf{q}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ for convenience. Notice that since (2.1) is convex for the range of q_k specified, it implies that every local minimizer is a global minimizer of the functional. The optimality conditions for a general vector x with components x_k for $k \in (1, \ldots, N)$ can be written down in component-wise form, as derived in Lemma 2.1 below. Note that as $F_{\mathbf{1},\lambda}$ is a special case of $F_{\mathbf{q},\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$, the componentwise conditions below reduce to the well known optimality conditions of the ℓ_1 penalized functional when $q_k = 1$ for all k.

Lemma 2.1 *The conditions for the minimizer of the functional $F(x)$ as defined in (2.1) are:*

$$\begin{array}{lll} \{A^T(b - Ax)\}_k & = \lambda_k \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1}, & x_k \neq 0 \quad (1 \leq q_k \leq 2) \\ \{A^T(b - Ax)\}_k & = 0, & x_k = 0 \quad (q_k > 1) \\ \left|\{A^T(b - Ax)\}_k\right| & \leq \lambda_k, & x_k = 0 \quad (q_k = 1) \end{array} \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. Since for the case $1 \leq q_k \leq 2$, $F(x)$ is convex, any local minimizer is necessarily global and to characterize the minimizer it is necessary only to work out the conditions corresponding to $F(x) \leq F(x + tz)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$. $F(x) \leq F(x + tz)$ implies that

$$t^2 ||Az||^2 + 2t\langle z, A^T(Ax - b)\rangle + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k \left(|x_k + tz_k|^{q_k} - |x_k|^{q_k}\right) \geq 0. \tag{2.3}$$

We shall derive N conditions, one for each index $k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. To get the k-th condition, we consider z of the special form $z = z_k e_k$ (i.e. all entries of z are 0, except for the k-th entry). We define $f(t) = |x_k + tz_k|^{q_k}$. When $x_k \neq 0$, this is C^∞ at $t = 0$. Using a Taylor series expansion around 0, we then get $f(t) = f(0) + tf'(0) + O(t^2)$.

We now separately analyze the cases: $x_k \neq 0$ and $x_k = 0$. When $x_k \neq 0$, we can take t small enough that $\operatorname{sgn}(x_k + tz_k) = \operatorname{sgn}(x_k)$. Keeping t fixed we analyze both signs of x_k. For $x_k > 0$, we have $\operatorname{sgn}(x_k) = 1$ and $|x_k + tz_k| = x_k + tz_k$, so that:

$$f(t) = (x_k + tz_k)^{q_k} \implies f'(t) = \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k (x_k + tz_k)^{q_k - 1} = \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k + tz_k|^{q_k - 1}$$

When $x_k < 0$, we have $\operatorname{sgn}(x_k) = -1$ and $|x_k + tz_k| = -(x_k + tz_k)$, so that:

$$f(t) = (-x_k - tz_k)^{q_k} \implies f'(t) = -q_k z_k (-x_k - tz_k)^{q_k - 1} = \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k + tz_k|^{q_k - 1}$$

Thus, $f'(0) = \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1}$ for all $x_k \neq 0$. Thus, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the Taylor expansion of f becomes:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f(t) & = & |x_k + tz_k|^{q_k} = |x_k|^{q_k} + t \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1} + O(t^2) \\ & \leq & |x_k|^{q_k} + t \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1} + Ct^2, \end{array}$$

This implies in particular that $|x_k + tz_k|^{q_k} - |x_k|^{q_k} \leq t \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1} + Ct^2$. Using this and $z = z_k e_k$ in (2.3) gives:

$$\begin{array}{rl} & t^2 \|A(z_k e_k)\|^2 + 2t\langle z_k e_k, A^T(Ax - b)\rangle + 2\lambda_k \left(t \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1} + Ct^2\right) \geq 0 \\ \implies & t^2 \left(\|A(z_k e_k)\|^2 + 2C\lambda_k\right) + 2t \left(z_k \{A^T(Ax - b)\}_k + \lambda_k \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1}\right) \geq 0. \end{array}$$

The first term can be made arbitrary small with respect to the second term, so as this holds for both positive and negative t this implies:

$$z_k\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k + \lambda_k \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k z_k |x_k|^{q_k-1} = 0,$$

which leads to:

$$\{A^T(b-Ax)\}_k = \lambda_k \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k |x_k|^{q_k-1}\,,\ x_k \neq 0.$$

Note that when $q_k = 1$ we recover the familiar condition for ℓ_1-minimization:

$$\{A^T(b-Ax)\}_k = \lambda_k \operatorname{sgn}(x_k)\,,\ x_k \neq 0.$$

When $x_k = 0$, recalling that $z = z_k e_k$, (2.3) gives:

$$t^2||A(z_k e_k)||^2 + 2t\langle z_k e_k, A^T(Ax-b)\rangle + 2\lambda_k |t|^{q_k}|z_k|^{q_k} \geq 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Making the substitutions $t^2 = |t|^2$, $t = |t|\operatorname{sgn}(t)$, we obtain

$$|t|^2||A(z_k e_k)||^2 + |t|\left(2\operatorname{sgn}(t) z_k\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k + 2\lambda_k |t|^{q_k-1}|z_k|^{q_k}\right) \geq 0. \tag{2.5}$$

In this case, we have to consider the case $q_k = 1$ and $q_k > 1$ separately. When $q_k > 1$ we have that:

$$|t|^2||Az||^2 + 2\lambda_k |t|^{q_k}|z_k|^{q_k} + 2|t|\operatorname{sgn}(t) z_k\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k \geq 0.$$

Since $q_k > 1$, the first two terms on the left have greater powers of $|t|$ than the last term and can be made arbitrarily smaller by picking t small enough. This means we must have:

$$2\operatorname{sgn}(t) z_k\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k \geq 0$$

for all t, which can be true only if $\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k = 0$. Thus, we conclude that the condition is :

$$\{A^T(b-Ax)\}_k = 0\,,\ x_k = 0 \quad (q_k > 1).$$

For $q_k = 1$ we have from (3) that:

$$\begin{aligned} & |t|^2||Az||^2 + |t|\left(2\operatorname{sgn}(t) z_k\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k + 2\lambda_k|z_k|\right) && \geq 0 \\ \Longrightarrow \quad & \operatorname{sgn}(t) z_k\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k + \lambda_k|z_k| && \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the two cases: where t and z_k have the same sign: $\operatorname{sgn}(t) = \operatorname{sgn}(z_k)$ or opposite signs: $\operatorname{sgn}(t) = -\operatorname{sgn}(z_k)$. Then we have, respectively:

$$\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k + \lambda_k \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad -\{A^T(Ax-b)\}_k + \lambda_k \geq 0,$$

so we obtain the condition :

$$\left|\{A^T(b-Ax)\}_k\right| \leq \lambda_k\,,\ x_k = 0 \quad (q_k = 1).$$

Thus, we can summarize the component-wise conditions for the minimizer of $F(x)$ as in (2.2). □

The conditions derived in Lemma 2.1 allow us to pick a strategy for selecting $\{\lambda_k\}$. As an example, for the case $q_k = 1$ and $\lambda_k = \lambda$ for all k we have that for $\lambda > \|A^T b\|_\infty$, the optimal solution is the zero vector. Hence, we typically would start at some value of λ just below $\|A^T b\|_\infty$ where the zero vector is a good initial guess. We can then iteratively decrease λ and use the previous solution as the initial guess at the next lower λ while we go down to some target residual. Well-known techniques such as the L-curve method [7] apply here.

2.2 Derivation of the algorithm

The iteratively reweighted least squares (IRLS) algorithm given by scheme (1.6) with weights (1.4) follows from the construction of a surrogate functional (2.6) which we will use in our analysis, as presented in Lemma 2.2 below. In our constructions, we split the index set $1 \leq k \leq N$ into two parts: $Q_1 = \{k : 1 \leq q_k < 2\}$ and $Q_2 = \{k : q_k = 2\}$.

Lemma 2.2 *Define the surrogate functional:*

$$\begin{aligned} G(x,a,w,\epsilon) &= \|Ax-b\|_2^2 - \|A(x-a)\|_2^2 + \|x-a\|_2^2 \\ &+ \sum_{k\in Q_1} \lambda_k \left(q_k w_k \left((x_k)^2 + \epsilon^2 \right) + (2-q_k)(w_k)^{\frac{q_k}{q_k-2}} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{k\in Q_2} \left[2\lambda_k \left((x_k)^2 + \epsilon^2 \right) (w_k^2 - 2w_k + 2) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Then the minimization procedure:

$$w^n = \arg\min_w G(x^n, a, w, \epsilon_n)$$

defines the iteration dependent weights:

$$w_k^n = \frac{1}{[(x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2]^{\frac{2-q_k}{2}}}. \tag{2.7}$$

In addition, the minimization procedure:

$$x^{n+1} = \arg\min_x G(x, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n)$$

produces the iterative scheme:

$$x_k^{n+1} = \frac{1}{1+\lambda_k q_k w_k^n} \left((x^n)_k - (A^T A x^n)_k + (A^T b)_k \right). \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. For the derivation of the weights from $w^n = \arg\min_w G(x^n, a, w, \epsilon_n)$, we take only the terms of G that depend on w. We derive separately the weights for $k \in Q_1$ and $k \in Q_2$. First, for $k \in Q_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial w_k} \left[q_k w_k ((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2) + (2-q_k)(w_k)^{\frac{q_k}{q_k-2}} \right] = 0 \\ \Longrightarrow \quad & q_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2 \right) + (2-q_k)\frac{q_k}{q_k-2}(w_k)^{\frac{q_k}{q_k-2}-1} = 0 \\ \Longrightarrow \quad & w_k^n = \frac{1}{[(x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2]^{\frac{2-q_k}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, for $k \in Q_2$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial w_k} \left[2\lambda_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2 \right) (w_k^2 - 2w_k + 2) \right] = 2\lambda_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2 \right) (2w_k - 2) = 0 \\ \Longrightarrow \quad & w_k^n = 1 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that this implies that (2.7) is valid for k in both sets Q_1 and Q_2 since for $k \in Q_2$, $q_k = 2$ and (2.7) gives $w_k^n = 1$ as required.

Next, we verify that the statement:

$$x_k^{n+1} = \left\{ \arg\min_x G(x, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) \right\}_k$$

recovers the iterative scheme (2.8), using that $w_k^n = 1$ for $k \in Q_2$, as just derived:

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) &= \|Ax - b\|_2^2 - \|A(x - x^n)\|_2^2 + \|x - x^n\|_2^2 \\ &+ \sum_{Q_1} \lambda_k \left(q_k w_k^n ((x_k)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2) + (2 - q_k)(w_k^n)^{\frac{q_k}{q_k - 2}} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{Q_2} \left[2\lambda_k \left((x_k)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

To prove (2.8), we again separately analyze the cases $k \in Q_1$ and $k \in Q_2$. We differentiate (2.9) with respect to x, then take the k-th component and set to zero. For $k \in Q_1$, removing terms of (2.9) that do not depend on x, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\|Ax - b\|_2^2 - \|A(x - x^n)\|_2^2 + \|x - x^n\|_2^2 + \sum_{k \in Q_1} \lambda_l q_l w_l^n x_l^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\|x\|_2^2 - 2\left(x, x^n + A^T b - A^T A x^n\right) + \sum_{k \in Q_1} \lambda_l q_l w_l^n x_l^2 \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and the result is:

$$-2\{A^T b\}_k + 2\{A^T A x^n\}_k + 2x_k - 2x_k^n + 2\lambda_k q_k w_k^n x_k = 0.$$

Then we solve for x_k and define x_k^{n+1} to be the result:

$$\begin{aligned} x_k(1 + \lambda_k q_k w_k^n) &= x_k^n + \{A^T b\}_k - \{A^T A x^n\}_k \\ \implies \qquad x_k^{n+1} &= \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_k q_k w_k^n} \left\{ x^n + A^T b - A^T A x^n \right\}_k. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in Q_2$, $w_k^n = 1$ and we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\|x\|_2^2 - 2\left(x, x^n + A^T b - A^T A x^n\right) + \sum_{k \in Q_2} 2\lambda_k x_k^2 \right) \\ &= -2\{A^T b\}_k + 2\{A^T A x^n\}_k + 2x_k - 2x_k^n + 4\lambda_k x_k = 0. \end{aligned}$$

which, upon solving for x_k, yields the scheme:

$$x_k^{n+1} = \frac{1}{1 + 2\lambda_k} \left\{ x^n + A^T b - A^T A x^n \right\}_k.$$

Thus, it follows that (2.8) holds for all $1 \le k \le N$. □

Remark 2.3 *Assume that as $n \to \infty$, $x^n \to x$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$. Notice that with the weights in (2.7), we have that:*

$$w_k^n (x_k^n)^2 = \frac{(x_k^n)^2}{((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2)^{\frac{2 - q_k}{2}}} \to \frac{x_k^2}{(x_k^2 + 0)^{\frac{2 - q_k}{2}}} = |x_k|^{q_k} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \ \text{if } x_k \neq 0.$$

Next, observe the result of the computation:

$$\begin{aligned} & q_k w_k^n \left((x_k)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right) + (2-q_k)(w_k^n)^{\frac{q_k}{q_k-2}} \\ = \;& q_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)^{\left(\frac{q_k-2}{2}+\frac{2}{2}\right)} + (2-q_k)\left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)^{\left(\frac{q_k-2}{2}\frac{q_k}{q_k-2}\right)} \\ = \;& 2\left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)^{\frac{q_k}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

It follows from (2.9) and $q_k = 2$, $w_k^n = 1$ for $k \in Q_2$ that:

$$\begin{aligned} G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) = \|Ax^n - b\|_2^2 \;\; & + \sum_{k\in Q_1} \lambda_k \left(q_k w_k^n((x_k)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2) + (2-q_k)(w_k^n)^{\frac{q_k}{q_k-2}}\right) \\ & + \sum_{k\in Q_2} \left[2\lambda_k \left((x_k)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)\right], \end{aligned}$$

which using (2.10), reduces to:

$$\|Ax^n - b\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{k\in Q_1} \lambda_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)^{\frac{q_k}{2}} + 2\sum_{k\in Q_2} \lambda_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)^{\frac{2}{2}} \tag{2.11}$$

Thus, we recover:

$$G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) = \|Ax^n - b\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)^{\frac{q_k}{2}}, \tag{2.12}$$

As $n \to \infty$, assuming $x^n \to x$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$, we have that:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k |x_k|^{q_k},$$

so we recover the functional (2.1) we would like to minimize.

2.3 Summary of argument flow

Notation: With some abuse of notation, we will denote by $\{a_n\}$ the sequence $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and write $\{a_{n_l}\}$, $\{a_{n_{l_r}}\}$ for subsequences $(a_{n_l})_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(a_{n_{l_r}})_{r\in\mathbb{N}}$, respectively. By F we will refer to the functional $F_{\mathbf{q},\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(x)$ in (2.1). We demonstrate that for our set of iterates $\{x^n\}$ from (1.6), we have convergence to the minimizing value, i.e. $\lim_{n\to\infty} F(x^n) = F(\bar{x})$, where $\bar{x}$ is such that $F(\bar{x}) \le F(x)$ for all x. Under some conditions on F, the minimizer will be unique. In that case, we have that $x^n \to \bar{x}$. These statements will all follow from a few properties of F and G, which we now state.

Suppose we have the following conditions for functions F and G (from (2.1) and (2.6)) and the sequence of iterates x^n from (1.6):

- (1) $0 \le F(x^n) \le G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n), \;\forall\, n$
- (2) $G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) \le G(x^{n-1}, x^{n-1}, w^{n-1}, \epsilon_{n-1})$
- (3) $\exists$ subsequence $\{x^{n_l}\}$ of $\{x^n\}$ for which $\lim_{l\to\infty} [G(x^{n_l}, x^{n_l}, w^{n_l}, \epsilon_{n_l}) - F(x^{n_l})] = 0$.
- (4) $\|x^n\|$ is bounded, which implies that any subsequence of $\{x^n\}$ has a weakly convergent subsequence; in particular $\{x^{n_l}\}$ has a convergent subsequence $\{x^{n_{l_r}}\}$.

- (5) The limit $\bar{x}$ of the particular convergent subsequence $\{x^{n_{l_r}}\}$ satisfies the optimality conditions of F (i.e. $F(\bar{x}) \leq F(x)$ for all x).

We now show that we can conclude from these that $\lim_{n\to\infty} F(x^n) = F(\bar{x})$, an important result, as it states that the iterates converge to the minimizing value of the functional. First, let us define the sequence $\{g_n\} := G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n)$. Note from (1) and (2) that $\{g_n\}$ is bounded from below and monotonically decreasing, it follows that this sequence converges as $n \to \infty$, say to some $\bar{g}$. Consequently, $\{G(x^{n_l}, x^{n_l}, w^{n_l}, \epsilon_{n_l})\} = \{g_{n_l}\}$ converges to $\bar{g}$ as $l \to \infty$. By (3) it then follows that $\{F(x^{n_l})\}$ also converges to $\bar{g}$ as $l \to \infty$. Since we know that $x^{n_{l_r}} \to \bar{x}$, it follows from the continuity of F that $\{F(x^{n_{l_r}})\} \to \{F(\bar{x})\}$; consequently $\bar{g} = F(\bar{x})$ and hence $F(x^{n_l}) \to F(\bar{x})$ as $l \to \infty$, where $F(\bar{x}) \leq F(x)$ for all x.

Finally, we like to show that $F(x^n) \to F(\bar{x})$. Note that for any $\sigma > 0$, $\exists L$ such that $\forall l \geq L$ we have that $|F(x^{n_l}) - F(\bar{x})| < \sigma$. Next, for every $n \geq n_l \geq l$, we have that:

$$F(x^{n_l}) = g_{n_l} \geq g_n = G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) \geq F(x^n)$$

where $g_{n_l} \geq g_n$ since $n_l \leq n$. So this means that $F(x^{n_l}) \geq F(x^n)$ and we know from before that $|F(x^{n_l}) - F(\bar{x})| = F(x^{n_l}) - F(\bar{x}) < \sigma$, which implies that $F(x^n) - F(\bar{x}) < \sigma$ for $n \geq n_l$, where we have used that $F(\bar{x}) \leq F(x)$ for all x. It follows that $F(x^n) \to F(\bar{x})$. This implies, in particular, that for any accumulation point $\hat{x}$ of $\{x^n\}$, we have $F(\hat{x}) = F(\bar{x})$ (since $\hat{x}$ is the limit of a subsequence of $\{x^n\}$ and F is continuous). In the case that the minimizer of F is unique and equal to $\bar{x}$, it follows that $\bar{x}$ is the only possible accumulation point of $\{x^n\}$, i.e. that $x^n \to \bar{x}$. The majority of the work in the convergence argument which follows goes into introducing a proper construction for the ϵ_n sequence and showing that the properties (1) - (5) hold for this choice.

3 Analysis of the IRLS algorithm

Having set out the fundamentals (derivation of the scheme and outline of the convergence proof), we go on to analyze the IRLS scheme in (1.6), with weights w_k^n defined by (1.4) and $\{\epsilon_n\}$ as defined by (1.5) and to prove convergence by showing properties (1) to (5) from Section 2.3 hold. We will use the assumption that $\|A\|_2 < 1$ (that is, the spectral or operator norm of the matrix A is less than one, which can be accomplished by simple rescaling using the largest singular value). The largest singular value can typically be accurately estimated using a few iterations of the power scheme.

Lemma 3.1 *Let the surrogate functional G be given by (2.6) of Lemma 2.2 and F be the functional in (2.1). Then property (1) above holds.*

Proof. The proof follows by direct verification using the result of Remark 2.3.

$$\begin{aligned} G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) &= \|Ax^n - b\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2\right)^{\frac{q_k}{2}} \\ &\geq F(x^n) = \|Ax^n - b\|_2^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k |x_k^n|^{q_k} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.2 *Assuming that the spectral norm $\|A\|_2 < 1$, the sequence of iterates $\{x^n\}$ generated by (1.6) satisfy $\|x^n - x^{n-1}\|_2 \to 0$ and are bounded in ℓ_1-norm ($\|x^n\| \leq K$ for $K \in \mathbb{R}$).*

Proof. Using the results from Lemma 2.2, we write down a sequence of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} G(x^{n+1}, x^{n+1}, w^{n+1}, \epsilon_{n+1}) &\leq G(x^{n+1}, x^{n+1}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n+1}) \quad [A] \\ &\leq G(x^{n+1}, x^{n}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n+1}) \quad [B] \\ &\leq G(x^{n+1}, x^{n}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n}) \quad [C] \\ &\leq G(x^{n}, x^{n}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n}). \quad [D] \end{aligned}$$

We now offer explanations for $[A - D]$. First, $[A]$ follows from $w^{n+1} = \arg\min_{w} G(x^{n+1}, a, w, \epsilon_{n+1})$. Next for $[B]$, we have:

$$G(x^{n+1}, x^{n}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n+1}) - G(x^{n+1}, x^{n+1}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n+1}) = \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 - \|A(x^n - x^{n+1})\|_2^2, \tag{3.1}$$

It follows that $\|A(x - x^n)\|_2 \leq \|A\|_2 \|x - x^n\|_2 < \|x - x^n\|_2$ for $\|A\|_2 < 1$ so that $\|x - x^n\|_2^2 - \|A(x - x^n)\|_2^2 > 0$. Next, $[C]$ follows from $\epsilon_{n+1} \leq \epsilon_n$ (directly from (1.5)). Finally, $[D]$ follows from $x^{n+1} = \arg\min_{x} G(x, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n)$. We now set up a telescoping sum of non-negative terms, using the inequalities $[A - D]$ above:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=1}^{P} \left(G(x^{n+1}, x^{n}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n+1}) - G(x^{n+1}, x^{n+1}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n+1}) \right) \\ &\quad \leq \sum_{n=1}^{P} \left(G(x^{n}, x^{n}, w^{n}, \epsilon_{n}) - G(x^{n+1}, x^{n+1}, w^{n+1}, \epsilon_{n+1}) \right) \\ &\quad = G(x^1, x^1, w^1, \epsilon_1) - G(x^{P+1}, x^{P+1}, w^{P+1}, \epsilon_{P+1}) \leq G(x^1, x^1, w^1, \epsilon_1) =: C \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n)$ is always ≥ 0 and $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Using (3.1), it follows that:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{P} \left(\|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 - \|A(x^n - x^{n+1})\|_2^2 \right) \leq C.$$

Since $\|A(x^n - x^{n+1})\|_2^2 \leq \|A\|_2^2 \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2$ and $\|A\|_2 < 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 - \|A(x^n - x^{n+1})\|_2^2 &\geq \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 - \|A\|_2^2 \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 \\ &= \alpha \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha := (1 - \|A\|_2^2) > 0$. Consequently, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{P} \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{P} \left(\|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 - \|A(x^n - x^{n+1})\|_2^2 \right) \leq C \\ \implies & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2^2 < \infty \\ \implies & \|x^n - x^{n+1}\|_2 \to 0. \end{aligned}$$

To prove that the $\{x^n\}$ are bounded, we use the result from Remark 2.3:

$$G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n) = \|Ax^n - b\|_2^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_k \left((x_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2 \right)^{\frac{q_k}{2}} \geq \lambda_k |x_k^n|^{q_k},$$

It follows that:

$$|x_k^n| \leq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_k} G(x^n, x^n, w^n, \epsilon_n)\right)^{\frac{1}{q_k}} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_k} G(x^1, x^1, w^1, \epsilon_1)\right)^{\frac{1}{q_k}} =: C_1$$

This implies the boundedness of $\{x^n\}$:

$$\|x^n\|_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{N} |x_k^n| \leq N \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_k} G(x^1, x^1, w^1, \epsilon_1)\right)^{\frac{1}{q_k}} =: C_2.$$

□

By Lemma 3.2 we have that property (2) holds and that $\|x^n\|_1$ is bounded in (4). The next lemma demonstrates property (3) and the existence of a convergent subsequence $x^{n_{l_r}}$.

Lemma 3.3 *There exists a subsequence $\{\epsilon_{n_l}\}$ of $\{\epsilon_n\}$ such that every member of the subsequence is defined by:*

$$\epsilon_{n_l} = \left(\|x^{n_l} - x^{n_l - 1}\|_2 + \alpha^{n_l}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \epsilon_{n_l - 1}.$$

Additionally, there is a subsequence of this subsequence $\{n_{l_r}\}$ such that $\{x^{n_{l_r}}\}_r$ is convergent.

Proof. By the definition of the ϵ_n's in (1.5) and by Lemma 3.2, we know that $\epsilon_n \to 0$, since $\|x^n - x^{n-1}\| \to 0$ and $\alpha^n \to 0$. It follows that a subsequence $\{n_l\}$ must exist such that $\epsilon_{n_l} < \epsilon_{n_l - 1}$, for otherwise, the monotonicity $\epsilon_{n+1} \leq \epsilon_n$ combined with $\epsilon_n > 0$ for all n would imply the existence of N_0 such that for $n \geq N_0$, $\epsilon_{n+1} = \epsilon_n$, implying that the sequence of ϵ_n's would not converge to zero. The fact that n_{l_r} exists is a consequence of the boundedness of the iterates $\{x^n\}$ and hence that of $\{x^{n_l}\}$, Lemma 3.2, and the standard fact that any bounded sequence in $\mathbb{R}^N$ has at least one accumulation point. □

By Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.2, we have that $\epsilon_{n_l} \to 0$ as $l \to \infty$. Thus, together with (2.12), it follows that (3) holds.

Lemma 3.4 *The limit $\bar{x}$ of the converging subsequence $\{x^{n_{l_r}}\}$ satisfies the optimality conditions (2.2) of the convex functional (2.1):*

$$\begin{array}{rll} \{A^T(b - Ax)\}_k & = \lambda_k \operatorname{sgn}(x_k) q_k |x_k|^{q_k - 1}, & x_k \neq 0 \quad (1 \leq q_k \leq 2) \\ \left|\{A^T(b - Ax)\}_k\right| & \leq \lambda_k, & x_k = 0 \quad (q_k = 1) \\ \{A^T(b - Ax)\}_k & = 0, & x_k = 0 \quad (q_k > 1) \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. That:

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} x_k^{n_{l_r}} = \bar{x}_k \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N,$$

follows by the boundedness of x^{n_l} as discussed in Lemma 3.3. For each k, we consider three separate cases, depending on the limit $\bar{x}_k$.

(1) $\bar{x}_k \neq 0$ and $1 \leq q_k \leq 2$,

(2) $\bar{x}_k = 0$ and $q_k = 1$,

(3) $\bar{x}_k = 0$ and $q_k > 1$.

Since $x^{n_{l_r}} \to \bar{x}$ and by Lemma 3.2, $\|x^n - x^{n+1}\| \to 0$, we have that: $x_k^{n_{l_r}+1} \to \bar{x}_k$. We can rewrite the iterative scheme (1.6) as:

$$x_k^{n+1}\left(1 + \lambda_k q_k w_k^n\right) = x_k^n + \{A^T(b - Ax^n)\}_k$$

Specializing this to $\{x^{n_{l_r}}\}$ and reordering terms, we have:

$$\lambda_k q_k w_k^{n_{l_r}} x_k^{n_{l_r}+1} = x_k^{n_{l_r}} - x_k^{n_{l_r}+1} + \{A^T(b - Ax^{n_{l_r}})\}_k.$$

Since the right hand side converges to a limit as $r \to \infty$, so must the left hand side; we obtain:

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} w_k^{n_{l_r}} x_k^{n_{l_r}+1} = \frac{1}{\lambda_k q_k}\{A^T(b - A\bar{x})\}_k. \tag{3.3}$$

We will use this to compute $\{A^T(b - A\bar{x})\}_k$ and to verify that (2.2) is satisfied. We are thus interested in the value of $\lim_{r\to\infty} w_k^{n_{l_r}} x_k^{n_{l_r}+1}$.

In case (1), $\lim_{r\to\infty} x_k^{n_{l_r}} = \bar{x_k} \neq 0$, we obtain

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} w_k^{n_{l_r}} x_k^{n_{l_r}+1} = \lim_{l\to\infty} w_k^{n_{l_r}} x_k^{n_{l_r}} \frac{x_k^{n_{l_r}+1}}{x_k^{n_{l_r}}} = \lim_{l\to\infty} x_k^{n_{l_r}} w_k^{n_{l_r}},$$

where we have used that $\lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{x_k^{n_{l_r}+1}}{x_k^{n_{l_r}}} = 1$, since $\|x^{n+1} - x^n\| \to 0$. Using (1.4), it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{r\to\infty} w_k^{n_{l_r}} x_k^{n_{l_r}+1} &= \lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{x_k^{n_{l_r}}}{\left[(x_k^{n_{l_r}})^2 + (\epsilon_{n_{l_r}})^2\right]^{\frac{2-q_k}{2}}} = \frac{\overline{x_k}}{\left((\overline{x_k})^2 + 0\right)^{\frac{2-q_k}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(\overline{x_k})\,|\overline{x_k}|}{|\overline{x_k}|^{2-q_k}} = \operatorname{sgn}(\overline{x_k})|\overline{x_k}|^{q_k-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (3.3), we obtain that: $\{A^T(b - A\bar{x})\}_k = \lambda_k q_k \operatorname{sgn}(\overline{x_k})|x_k|^{q_k-1}$, in accordance with (2.2).

In case (2) and (3), $\lim_{r\to\infty} x^{n_{l_r}} = \overline{x_k} = 0$, and we still have that (3.3) holds. Writing out (1.6) for $x^{n_{k_{l_r}}}$ in terms of $x^{n_{k_{l_r}}-1}$, we obtain:

$$\lambda_k q_k w_k^{n_{l_r}-1} x_k^{n_{l_r}} = x_k^{n_{l_r}-1} - x_k^{n_{l_r}} + \{A^T(b - Ax^{n_{l_r}-1})\}_k.$$

which gives the limit:

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} w_k^{n_{l_r}-1} x_k^{n_{l_r}} = \frac{1}{\lambda_k q_k}\{A^T(b - A\bar{x})\}_k. \tag{3.4}$$

We define β_k to be:

$$\beta_k = \frac{1}{\lambda_k q_k}\{A^T(b - A\bar{x})\}_k$$

To prove that (2.2) is satisfied, we must show that $|\beta_k| \leq 1$ for case (2) and that $\beta_k = 0$ for case (3).

We first write down some relations with β_k which we will use. Note that by (3.4), $\lim_{r\to\infty} w_k^{n_{l_r}-1} x_k^{n_{l_r}} = \beta_k$. It follows that for every $\sigma \in (0,1), \exists r_0$ such that for every $r \geq r_0$:

$$\left(w_k^{n_{l_r}-1} x_k^{n_{l_r}}\right)^2 > (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2 \implies \left(x_k^{n_{l_r}}\right)^2 > (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2 \left(w_k^{n_{l_r}-1}\right)^{-2} = (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2 \left((x_k^{n_{l_r}-1})^2 + (\epsilon_{n_{l_r}-1})^2\right)^{2-q_k}$$

Since $\epsilon_{n_{l_r}} < \epsilon_{n_{l_r}-1}$, it follows that for r sufficiently large::

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(x_k^{n_{l_r}}\right)^2 &> (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2\left((x_k^{n_{l_r}-1})^2 + (\epsilon_{n_{l_r}})^2\right)^{2-q_k} \\
&= (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2\left((x_k^{n_{l_r}-1})^2 + \|x^{n_{l_r}} - x^{n_{l_r}-1}\|_2 + \alpha^{n_{l_r}}\right)^{2-q_k} \\
&\geq (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2\left((x_k^{n_{l_r}-1})^2 + |x_k^{n_{l_r}} - x_k^{n_{l_r}-1}| + \alpha^{n_{l_r}}\right)^{2-q_k} \\
&> (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2\left((x_k^{n_{l_r}-1})^2 + |x_k^{n_{l_r}} - x_k^{n_{l_r}-1}|\right)^{2-q_k}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used in the last part that $\alpha^{n_{l_r}} \to 0$. To simplify notation, let us set $u = x_k^{n_{l_r}-1}$ and $v = x_k^{n_{l_r}} - x_k^{n_{l_r}-1}$. Then in terms of u and v, we have:

$$(u+v)^2 > (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2\left(u^2 + |v|\right)^{2-q_k} \tag{3.5}$$

Notice that for any $K > 0$:

$$0 \leq \left(\sqrt{K}u - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}v\right)^2 = Ku^2 + \frac{1}{K}v^2 - 2uv$$

It follows that:

$$(u+v)^2 = u^2 + 2uv + v^2 \leq u^2 + Ku^2 + \frac{1}{K}v^2 + v^2 = (1+K)u^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{K}\right)v^2 \tag{3.6}$$

Using (3.6) in (3.5), we get:

$$(1-\sigma)\beta_k^2\left(u^2 + |v|\right)^{2-q_k} < (1+K)u^2 + (1+\frac{1}{K})v^2 \tag{3.7}$$

Let us now consider case (2) where $q_k = 1$. We assume that $\beta_k > 1$ and derive a contradiction. Rearranging terms in (3.7) yields:

$$\left((1-\sigma)\beta_k^2 - (1+K)\right)u^2 < (1+\frac{1}{K})v^2 - (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2|v| = \left((1+\frac{1}{K})|v| - (1-\sigma)\beta_k^2\right)|v| \tag{3.8}$$

Since we assume that $\beta_k^2 > 1$, we can choose our $\sigma < 1$ small enough such that $(1-\sigma)\beta_k^2 > 1$; once σ is fixed, we can choose $K > 0$ small enough such that $(1-\sigma)\beta_k^2 \geq (1+K)$; with these choices of σ and K, the left hand side of (3.8) ≥ 0. With this fixed choice of σ and K we analyze the right hand side of (3.8). Note that by Lemma 3.2, we have that $\|x^{n_{l_r}} - x^{n_{l_r}-1}\|_2 \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. This means that $|v| \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. For sufficiently large r, we will have $|v| < \left(1 + \frac{1}{K}\right)^{-1}(1-\sigma)\beta_k^2$, implying that the right hand side of (3.8) would then be ≤ 0. This is in contradiction with the left hand side of this strict inequality (3.8) being ≥ 0. It follows that the assumption $|\beta_k| > 1$ is not correct. Hence, we have $|\beta_k| \leq 1$ which implies that $|\{A^T(b - A\bar{x})\}_k| \leq \lambda_k$, consistent with (2.2).

Finally, consider case (3) with $q_k > 1$. We assume that $\beta_k > 0$ and derive a contradiction. In this case, (3.7) does not simplify further:

$$\beta_k^2(1-\sigma)\left(u^2 + |v|\right)^{2-q_k} < (1+K)u^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{K}\right)v^2 \quad \text{for all } K > 0. \tag{3.9}$$

This means in particular that:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_k^2(1-\sigma)u^{2(2-q_k)} &< (1+K)u^2 + \left(1+\frac{1}{K}\right)v^2 \quad \text{and} \\ \beta_k^2(1-\sigma)|v|^{(2-q_k)} &< (1+K)u^2 + \left(1+\frac{1}{K}\right)v^2.\end{aligned}$$

Then the average of the terms is also smaller than this quantity:

$$\frac{1}{2}\beta_k^2(1-\sigma)\left(u^{2(2-q_k)} + |v|^{(2-q_k)}\right) < (1+K)u^2 + \left(1+\frac{1}{K}\right)v^2.$$

Rearranging terms again, we have:

$$u^{2(2-q_k)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\beta_k^2(1-\sigma) - (1+K)u^{2(q_k-1)}\right) < \left(1+\frac{1}{K}\right)v^2 - \frac{1}{2}\beta_k^2(1-\sigma)|v|^{(2-q_k)}.$$

Since $q_k > 1$ and thus $2-q_k < 1$, we have that for v sufficiently small (obtained by taking r sufficiently large), the right hand side is negative, by the same logic as in the previous case (since $\beta_k > 0$ by assumption and for large r, $v \to 0$ and the first term will go to zero faster than the second). Thus, by the above inequality, for r sufficiently large, the left hand side, bounded above by the negative right hand side, must be negative as well. Since $u^{2(2-q_k)}$ is non-negative, that is possible only when:

$$\frac{1}{2}\beta_k^2(1-\sigma) - (1+K)u^{2(q_k-1)} < 0$$

for r sufficiently large. However, since $\lim_{r\to\infty} u^{2(q_k-1)} = \lim_{r\to\infty}(x_k^{n_{l_r}-1})^{2(q_k-1)} = 0$, this condition cannot be satisfied for large r. This contradicts our original assumption that $\beta_k > 0$. Hence, we conclude that $\beta_k = 0 \implies \{A^T(b-A\bar{x})\}_k = 0$, which is the right optimality condition. □

Lemma 3.4, together with the proceeding Lemmas in this section, show that properties (1) to (5) of Section 2.3 hold. It thus follows from the argument in Section 2.3 that we have $F(x^n) \to F(\bar{x})$.

4 Numerics

We now discuss some aspects of the numerical implementation and performance of the IRLS algorithm. We first illustrate performance for the case $q_k = 1$ for all k, where it's easiest to compare with existing algorithms. Then we discuss a simple example concerning a case where different values of q_k can be used. An implementation of the scheme as given by (1.6) has the same computational complexity as ISTA in (1.2). Not surprisingly, the performance of the two schemes is also similar. However, the speed-up idea behind FISTA as described in [1] can also be applied to the IRLS algorithm. FISTA was designed to minimize the function $f(x)+g(x)$, where f is a continuously differentiable convex function with Lipschitz continuous gradient (i.e., $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|_2 \leq L\|x-y\|_2$ for some constant $L > 0$), and g is a continuous convex function such as $2\tau\|x\|_1$ in the ℓ_1-penalized functional. FISTA uses the proximal mapping function:

$$p_L(y) = \arg\min_x \left\{ g(x) + \frac{L}{2}\left\| x - \left(y - \frac{1}{L}\nabla f(y)\right)\right\|_2^2 \right\}$$

to define the following algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned} y^1 &= x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^N \quad , \quad t_1 = 1 \quad , \quad \text{and for } n = 1, 2, \ldots, \\ x^{n+1} &= p_L(y^n) = \arg\min_x \left\{ g(x) + \frac{L}{2} \left\| x - (y^n - \frac{1}{L}\nabla f(y^n)) \right\|^2 \right\} \\ t_{n+1} &= \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4t_n^2}}{2} \\ y^{n+1} &= x^{n+1} + \frac{t_n - 1}{t_{n+1}}(x^{n+1} - x^n). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

In the case that $f(x) = \|Ax - b\|_2^2$ and $g(x) = 2\tau\|x\|_1$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|_2 &= \|2A^TAx - 2A^TAy\|_2 = \|2A^TA(x - y)\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\|A^TA\|_2\|x - y\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that when A is scaled such that $\|A\|_2 \approx 1$, the Lipschitz constant can be taken to be $L = 2$. It follows that:

$$g(x) + \frac{L}{2} \left\| x - (y - \frac{1}{L}\nabla f(y)) \right\|_2^2 = 2\tau\|x\|_1 + \left\| x - (y - A^T(Ay - b)) \right\|_2^2 \tag{4.2}$$

Using (4.2) in (4.1), we obtain:

$$x^{n+1} = \arg\min_x \left\{ 2\tau\|x\|_1 + \left\| x - (y^n - A^T(Ay^n - b)) \right\|_2^2 \right\} = \mathbb{S}_\tau \left(y^n - A^TAy^n + A^Tb \right) \tag{4.3}$$

where we have used (1.1). We note that (4.3) is very similar to the ISTA scheme in (1.2), except the thresholding is applied to $\{y^n\}$. In the same way, we can coin the FIRLS algorithm by performing the steps in (4.1), using

$$x^{n+1} = \frac{1}{1 + \tau \left[(y_k^n)^2 + (\epsilon_n)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left\{ y^n - A^TAy^n + A^Tb \right\}_k \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N \tag{4.4}$$

in place of (4.3). With the more general weights given by (1.4), we can specialize this algorithm to our functional (2.1).

We now demonstrate some results of simple numerical experiments. We begin with the $q_k = 1$ case for all k. We also let the regularization parameter be the same for all k, setting $\lambda_k = \tau$. For the first test, we use two differently conditioned random matrices (built up via a reverse SVD procedure with orthogonal random matrices U and V, obtained by performing a QR factorization on the Gaussian random matrices, and a custom diagonal matrix of singular values S, to form a 1000×1000 matrix $A = USV^T$), and a sparse signal x with 5% nonzeros. We form $b = Ax$ and use the different algorithms to recover $\tilde{x}$ using a single run of 300 iterations with $\tau = \frac{\max|A^Tb|}{10^5}$. In Figure 1, we plot the decrease of ℓ_1-functional values $F_1(x^n)$ and recovery percent errors $100\frac{\|x^n - x\|}{\|x\|}$ versus the iterate number n, using four algorithms: IRLS, FIRLS, ISTA, and FISTA for two matrix types: A_1, with singular values logspaced between 1 and 0.1 and A_2, with singular values logspaced between 1 and 10^{-4}. We see that the peformance of ISTA/IRLS and FISTA/FIRLS are mostly similar, with better recovery using FISTA in the well-conditioned case, but almost identical performance in the worst-conditioned case.

In Figure 2, we run a compressive sensing experiment. We again take the 1000×1000 matrix of type A_2. Now we use a staircase-like sparse vector x with about 12% nonzeros. After we form

$b = Ax$, we zero out all but the first $\frac{1}{3}$ of the rows of A and b forming A_p and b_p (i.e. we only keep a portion of the measurements). We then recover solution $\tilde{x}$ using A_p and b_p while running across 20 different values of τ, starting with a zero initial guess at $\tau = \max|A^T b|$ and going down to $\tau = \frac{\max|A^T b|}{50000}$, while reusing the previous solutions as the initial guess at each new value of τ. From the Figure, we can see that the recovered solutions with FIRLS and FISTA are very similar.



Figure 1: Functional values $F(x^n)$ and recovery percent errors $100\frac{\|x^n - x\|}{\|x\|}$ versus the iterate number n for better and worse conditioned matrices (medians over 10 trials).



Figure 2: Row 1: sparse model x and the recovery percent errors vs τ. Row 2: final recovered solution with algorithms IRLS, FIRLS, ISTA, FISTA vs x.

Finally, we illustrate the use of the more general functional in (2.1) in Figure 3. We use the same setup as before, with the different algorithms running across multiple values of the regularization parameter τ, which is fixed for all k. However, we use a more complicated input signal, whose first half is sparse and whose second half is entirely dense. For this reason, in the IRLS schemes, we take $q_k = 1$ for the first half of the weights (for indices k from 1 to $\frac{n}{2}$) and $q_k = 1.9$ for the second half (for indices k from $\frac{n}{2} + 1$ to n). We observe that the recovered signal with the IRLS algorithms is superior to that of the ISTA/FISTA schemes which utilize $q_k = 1$ for all entries. Of course, seting the values of q_k for individual coefficients maybe difficult in practice unless one knows the distribution of the sparser and denser parts in advance, although in applications, some information of this nature may be available from the problem setup.



Figure 3: Row 1: half sparse / half dense model x and the recovery percent errors vs τ. Row 2: final recovered solution with algorithms IRLS, FIRLS, ISTA, FISTA vs x.

5 Conclusions

This manuscript presents a new iterative algorithm for obtaining regularized solutions to least squares systems of equations with sparsity constraints. The proposed iteratively reweighted least squares algorithm extends the work of [5] and is similar in form to the popular ISTA and FISTA algorithms [4, 1], but has the added benefit of being able to minimize a more general sparsity promoting functional. A major contribution of this work is the analysis of the algorithm, whose methodology can be applied also to related methods. The presented IRLS algorithm (1.6) is very simple to implement and use and offers performance similar to popular thresholding schemes, including the speedup benefit from the FISTA formulation. Because the surrogate functionals are all quadratic in the x_k, they lend themselves naturally to the use of a conjugate gradient approach, which enables further speed-up, as shown elsewhere [9, 6].

References

[1] Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 2(1):183–202, 2009. 2, 14, 17

[2] Jian-Feng Cai, Stanley Osher, and Zuowei Shen. Linearized bregman iterations for compressed sensing. *Mathematics of Computation*, 78(267):1515–1536, 2009. 1

[3] Emmanuel J Candès and Michael B Wakin. An introduction to compressive sampling. *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, 25(2):21–30, 2008. 1

[4] I. Daubechies, M. Defrise, and C. De Mol. An iterative thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems with a sparsity constraint. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 57(11):1413–1457, 2004. 1, 2, 17

[5] I. Daubechies, R. DeVore, M. Fornasier, and C. Sinan Güntürk. Iteratively reweighted least squares minimization for sparse recovery. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 63(1):1–38, 2010. 3, 17

[6] M. Fornasier, S. Peter, H. Rauhut, and S. Worm. Conjugate gradient acceleration of iteratively re-weighted least squares methods. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2015. 3, 17

[7] Per Christian Hansen. *The L-curve and its use in the numerical treatment of inverse problems*. IMM, Department of Mathematical Modelling, Technical Universityof Denmark, 1999. 5

[8] Frederik J Simons, Ignace Loris, Guust Nolet, Ingrid C Daubechies, S Voronin, JS Judd, Ph A Vetter, J Charléty, and C Vonesch. Solving or resolving global tomographic models with spherical wavelets, and the scale and sparsity of seismic heterogeneity. *Geophysical journal international*, 187(2):969–988, 2011. 1, 2

[9] S. Voronin. *Regularization of linear systems with sparsity constraints with applications to large scale inverse problems*. PhD thesis, Princeton University, Nov 2012. 1, 3, 17

[10] S. Voronin and R. Chartrand. A new generalized thresholding algorithm for inverse problems with sparsity constraints. *ICASSP*, 2013. 2

[11] S. Voronin, G. Ozkaya, and D. Yoshida. Convolution based smooth approximations to the absolute value function with application to non-smooth regularization. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2014. 2

[12] John Wright, Arvind Ganesh, Shankar Rao, Yigang Peng, and Yi Ma. Robust principal component analysis: Exact recovery of corrupted low-rank matrices via convex optimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2080–2088, 2009. 1

[13] Allen Y Yang, S Shankar Sastry, Arvind Ganesh, and Yi Ma. Fast l1-minimization algorithms and an application in robust face recognition: A review. In *Image Processing (ICIP), 2010 17th IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1849–1852. IEEE, 2010. 1

[14] Junfeng Yang and Yin Zhang. Alternating direction algorithms for l1-problems in compressive sensing. *SIAM journal on scientific computing*, 33(1):250–278, 2011. 1, 2

[15] Wotao Yin, Stanley Osher, Donald Goldfarb, and Jerome Darbon. Bregman iterative algorithms for l1-minimization with applications to compressed sensing. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 1(1):143–168, 2008. 1